



LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

Andrew F. Alber  
550 E. Swedesford Road, Suite 27  
Wayne, Pennsylvania 1908  
Andrew.Albero@lewisbrisbois.com  
Direct: 215.977.4058

July 18, 2022

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Robert B. Kugler  
United States District Court Judge  
District of New Jersey  
Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse  
4th & Cooper Streets Room 1050  
Camden, NJ 08101

Special Master the Honorable Thomas Vanaskie  
Stevens & Lee  
1500 Market Street, East Tower  
18th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

**Re: In re Valsartan, Losartan, and Irbesartan Products Liability Litigation  
Case No. 1:19-md-02875-RBK-JS  
(Michael Garrison v. Camber Pharmaceuticals, et al., Docket No.: 1:20-cv-15720-RBK-SAK)**

Dear Judge Kugler and Special Master Vanaskie:

We represent Defendant, Camber Pharmaceuticals, Inc., in the above referenced litigation. Please accept this letter as a request to deny or otherwise strike the moot and procedurally defective “Motion to Strike Defendant Camber’s Procedurally Defective Letter as in Violation of FRCP 7(b) and Notice of Appeal” filed by the *pro se* Losartan personal injury Plaintiff, Michael Garrison, on July 6, 2022 (Doc. 44). In the alternative, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7.1(d)(5), please accept this letter as an initial request for an extension to respond to Mr. Garrison’s Motion to Strike, which is set to be heard on the motion date of August 1, 2022. Counsel for Defendant Walmart joins in this request.

By background, this is a Losartan personal injury matter originally filed in the USDC for the Eastern District of Michigan (Case No. 5:19-cv-12536-JEL-EAS). This matter was transferred to MDL No. 2875 on or about November 10, 2020. Pursuant to MDL Case Management Order (“CMO”)

Page 2

23 at ¶2 “[n]o summary judgment motions may be filed without leave of court.” Without obtaining leave of court pursuant to CMO No. 23, and without filing a short from complaint as required under CMO 24, *pro se* Plaintiff previously filed an unsigned document entitled “Motion for Summary Judgment,” on April 20, 2022 (Doc. 37). As explained by Defendants in their letter of May 2, 2022 (Doc. 38), Mr. Garrison’s filing was premature and not in compliance with Local Civil Rules 7.1 and 56.1. The court later denied Plaintiff’s purported Motion for Summary Judgment without prejudice on May 13, 2022 (Doc. 39). Although Mr. Garrison never filed a short form complaint under CMO 24, he later filed a Motion for Leave of Court under CMO 23 (Doc. 40). As explained by Defendants in their letter of June 21, 2022 (Doc. 41), the Motion for Leave was procedurally defective, not in compliance with local rules, and premature because the parties in the MDL had not yet begun the discovery phase for Losartan personal injury cases. On June 23, 2022, the court appropriately denied Mr. Garrison’s Motion for Leave, clarifying that Mr. Garrison’s motion was premature and that any future attempts to move for summary judgment would be summarily denied until after Losartan discovery has concluded (Doc. 43).

Subsequently, on July 6, 2022, Mr. Garrison filed the instant Motion to Strike (Doc. 44). Inasmuch as the court has already denied Mr. Garrison’s premature request for leave to move for summary judgment in its Order of June 23, 2022 (Doc. 43), Mr. Garrison’s most recent filing should be stricken as moot. Moreover, the motion yet again fails to comply with the local rules and is otherwise procedurally improper.

If the court requires a formal response to Plaintiff’s most recent improper filing, Defendants request that the motion be deferred to the next motion date of August 15, 2022, with Defendants’ Opposition due on August 1, 2022. We appreciate the Court’s time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

*/s/ Andrew F. Albero*

Andrew F. Albero for  
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

cc: *Pro Se* Plaintiff, Michael Garrison, via Regular Mail  
David Sellinger, Esquire (counsel for Walmart)  
Adam Slater (lead counsel for MDL Plaintiffs)